

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3, 7, 9 and 10 are amended.

In section 2 on pages 2-3, the Office Action rejects claims 3 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The amendments to claims 3 and 9 clarify that the produced image data is not being stored inside the scanner device, but in a scan server external to the scanner as shown in Fig. 1 and described in the specification at page 7, lines 8-9, and page 9, lines 9-15. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection in section 2 on pages 2-3 of the Office Action be withdrawn.

In section 3 on page 3, the Office Action again rejects claims 3 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The amendments to claims 3 and 9 positively recite that the image data is transmitted to (and thus received by) the printing management device. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection in section 3 on page 3 of the Office Action be withdrawn.

In section 7 on pages 6-7, the Office Action objects to the drawings because they fail to show transmitting a scanner location to the printing management device. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to the claims addressed above in connection with the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 make clear that none of the claims recite transmitting a scanner location to the printing management device. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the drawings specified in section 7 of the Office Action be withdrawn.

In section 8 on page 7, the Office Action objects to claims 9 and 10 for the specified informality. Claim 9 is amended as suggested by the Office Action. Applicant believes that claim 10 was included in this rejection based on its dependence from claim 9. However, Applicant notes that all recitations of image data in claim 10 are recitations of multiple pieces of image data. Thus, claim 10 is amended to make all of these references to the produced multiple pieces of image data. It is respectfully submitted that claims 9 and 10 comply with all applicable standards. For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested the objection to claims 9 and 10 specified in section 8 of the Office Action be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 5-8, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,348,971 to Owa et. al. (hereinafter "Owa") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,930,465 to Bellucco et al. (hereinafter "Bellucco"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, from which claims 2, 5 and 6 depend, recites an image data storage device as a separate component of the printing system. Claim 1 also recites that the image data storage device stores and manages the image data produced by the image data producing means. Claim 7, from which claims 8, 11 and 12 depend, contains a similar recitation.

Neither Owa nor Bellucco, nor any other art of record, discloses, teaches or suggests an image data storage device that is a separate component from an image input device and that stores and manages image data produced by the image input device.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1, 2, 5-8, 11 and 12 as being unpatentable over Owa in view of Bellucco be withdrawn.

On pages 12-15, the Office Action rejects claims 3, 4, 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Owa in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,115,739 to Ogawa et al. (hereinafter "Ogawa"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 3, from which claim 4 depends, recites a storage management means that is a different component of the printing system than the scanner device, and recites that the storage

management means is for storing and managing the image data produced by the image data produced by the image data producing means. Claim 9, from which claim 10 depends, contains a similar recitation.

It is respectfully submitted that neither Owa nor Ogawa, nor any other prior art of record discloses, teaches or suggests a storage management means that is a separate component of a printing system from a scanner device and that stores and manages image data produced by an image data producing means within the scanner device.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 3, 4, 9 and 10 as being unpatentable over Owa in view of Ogawa be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-12 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Mark R. Woodall
Registration No. 43,286

JAO:MRW/jfb

Date: July 29, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
